

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/903,215	07/11/2001	Sergio Diaz De Leon	PGI6044P0181US 9964			
32116 7590 01/22/2007 WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET			EXAM	EXAMINER		
			CHOI, PETER Y			
SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
,			1771			
		·				
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			01/22/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. 09/903,215		Applicant(s)	
		DE LEON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter Y. Choi	1771	

Before the Filling of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Peter Y. Choi	1771			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A					
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
<ul> <li>a) Mean period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	· · · ·	mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 12-21,24,31 and 32.		ll be entered and an o	explanation of		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-11 and 25-30</u> .					
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				
13.  Other:		$\sim$			
		917			
tal.		ANDREW PIZIAL			
1/13/02	F	PRIMARY EXAMINE			

## **Application No. 09/903,215**

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: For example, the proposed amendments to the claims, such that the method requires that the first fibrous layer only is imaged and patterned on the image transfer device and the image comprises an array of upstanding projections and a network of liquic-accepting (sic) channels, or that the second fibrous layer forms a liquid-distribution layer devoid of said upstanding projections and said liquid accepting channels, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: due to the proposed amendments not being entered, Applicants' amendments are not commensurate in scope with the current claims. .